

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 18-1398V

Filed: October 28, 2019

UNPUBLISHED

SASHA WEISER-FREEDMAN,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Special Processing Unit (SPU);
Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;
Table Injury; Influenza (Flu) Vaccine;
Shoulder Injury Related to Vaccine
Administration (SIRVA)

Amy A. Senerth, Muller Brazil, LLP, Dresher, PA, for petitioner.

Jennifer Leigh Reynaud, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

Corcoran, Chief Special Master:

On September 14, 2018, petitioner filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*,² (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that that her October 17, 2016 influenza (“flu”) vaccination caused her to suffer a Shoulder Injury Related to Vaccine Administration (“SIRVA”). Petition at Preamble. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

¹ I intend to post this decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website. **This means the decision will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access. Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services).

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On October 28, 2019, respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he concedes that petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 1. Specifically, respondent indicates that

[m]edical personnel at DICP have reviewed the petition and medical records filed in this case. It is respondent's position that petitioner has satisfied the criteria set forth in the Vaccine Injury Table for SIRVA. 42 C.F.R. §§ 100.3(a), 100.3(c)(10). Additionally, DICP did not identify any other cause for petitioner's shoulder injury, and the medical records outlined above demonstrate that she suffered the residual effects of her condition for more than six months. Therefore, based on the record as it now stands, petitioner has satisfied all legal prerequisites for compensation under the Vaccine Act. See 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-13(a)(1)(B); 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-11(c)(1)(D)(i).

Id. at 4-5.

In view of respondent's position and the evidence of record, I find that petitioner is entitled to compensation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran

Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master